Gary M. Hoffman (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) Kenneth W. Brothers(<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN	
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN	
& OSHINSKY, LLP	
2101 L Street, NW Washington, DC 20037-1526	
Phone (202) 785-9700	
Fax (202) 887-0689	
Edward A. Meilman (Pro Hac Vice)	
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY, LLP	
1177 Avenue of the Americas	
New York, New York 10036-2714 Phone (212) 835-1400	
Fax (212) 997-9880	
Laffray P. Domain, State Par No. 126715	
Jeffrey B. Demain, State Bar No. 126715 Jonathan Weissglass, State Bar No. 185008	
ALTSHULER, BERZON, NUSSBAUM, RUI	BIN & DEMAIN
177 Post Street, Suite 300 San Francisco, California 94108	
Phone (415) 421-7151	
Fax (415) 362-8064	
Attorneys for Ricoh Company, Ltd.	
	TES DISTRICT COURT
TI TO DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTY	
	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA
	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA
	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA
RICOH COMPANY, LTD.,	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA ANCISCO DIVISION CASE NO. CV 03-04669-MJJ
SAN FRA	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA ANCISCO DIVISION)
RICOH COMPANY, LTD.,	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA ANCISCO DIVISION CASE NO. CV 03-04669-MJJ RICOH'S MOTION TO ADVANCE THE
RICOH COMPANY, LTD., Plaintiff, vs.	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA ANCISCO DIVISION CASE NO. CV 03-04669-MJJ RICOH'S MOTION TO ADVANCE THE
RICOH COMPANY, LTD., Plaintiff, vs. AEROFLEX INCORPORATED, et al.,	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA ANCISCO DIVISION CASE NO. CV 03-04669-MJJ RICOH'S MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE Date: Not Set Time: Not Set
RICOH COMPANY, LTD., Plaintiff, vs.	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA ANCISCO DIVISION CASE NO. CV 03-04669-MJJ RICOH'S MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE Date: Not Set
RICOH COMPANY, LTD., Plaintiff, vs. AEROFLEX INCORPORATED, et al.,	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA ANCISCO DIVISION CASE NO. CV 03-04669-MJJ RICOH'S MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE Date: Not Set Time: Not Set
RICOH COMPANY, LTD., Plaintiff, vs. AEROFLEX INCORPORATED, et al.,	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA ANCISCO DIVISION CASE NO. CV 03-04669-MJJ RICOH'S MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE Date: Not Set Time: Not Set
RICOH COMPANY, LTD., Plaintiff, vs. AEROFLEX INCORPORATED, et al.,	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA ANCISCO DIVISION CASE NO. CV 03-04669-MJJ RICOH'S MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE Date: Not Set Time: Not Set
RICOH COMPANY, LTD., Plaintiff, vs. AEROFLEX INCORPORATED, et al.,	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA ANCISCO DIVISION CASE NO. CV 03-04669-MJJ RICOH'S MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE Date: Not Set Time: Not Set
RICOH COMPANY, LTD., Plaintiff, vs. AEROFLEX INCORPORATED, et al.,	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA ANCISCO DIVISION CASE NO. CV 03-04669-MJJ RICOH'S MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE Date: Not Set Time: Not Set
RICOH COMPANY, LTD., Plaintiff, vs. AEROFLEX INCORPORATED, et al.,	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA ANCISCO DIVISION CASE NO. CV 03-04669-MJJ RICOH'S MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE Date: Not Set Time: Not Set
RICOH COMPANY, LTD., Plaintiff, vs. AEROFLEX INCORPORATED, et al.,	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA ANCISCO DIVISION CASE NO. CV 03-04669-MJJ RICOH'S MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE Date: Not Set Time: Not Set

CASE NO. CV 03-04669-MJJ
RICOH'S MOTION TO ADVANCE
THE CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

10

1314

15

17

16

18

1920

2122

2324

2526

27

28

Plaintiff, Ricoh Company, Ltd. (Ricoh), seeks an Order from this Court under Local Rule 6-3(a) to hold the Case Management Conference at a date to be set by the Court which is earlier than the presently scheduled date of February 10, 2004.

There have been no previous requests by any party to reschedule the Case Management Conference while this action has been pending in the Northern District of California.

Defendants' counsel has stated they have no objection in principle to an earlier Case Management Conference.

RELIEF REQUESTED

Specifically, Ricoh seeks an Order from this Court scheduling the Case Management Conference at a date earlier than the presently scheduled date of February 10, 2004. Ricoh proposes the date of December 9, 2003 since counsel for all parties will be before the Court in connection with a pending motion to stay this case.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. STATEMENT OF ISSUE TO BE DECIDED

Whether this Court should schedule the Case Management Conference at a date earlier than the presently scheduled date?

II. ARGUMENT

This case was begun in Delaware in January 2003. After a Case Management Conference was held in Delaware (a copy of the resulting Scheduling Order is attached to the Meilman Declaration as Exhibit A) and discovery was ongoing for months, the action was transferred to this Court. After being received in the Northern District of California, the case transferred within the District several times and is now assigned to Judge Jenkins because it is related to the later commenced *Synopsys Inc. v. Ricoh Company Ltd*, CV 03-02289 MJJ, a case in which the parties have already submitted a Case Management Report (copy attached to the Meilman Declaration as Exhibit B). In the above-captioned action, Case Management Conference notices by the clerk were issued and vacated as transfers within

this District took place. The Case Management Conference is now scheduled for February 10, 2004. The Case Management Conference in *Synopsys v. Ricoh* is also currently scheduled for February 10, 2004 and a similar motion is being concurrently made in that case.

In their motion to transfer to this Court, the defendants asked the Delaware court to transfer the action here so that it could be consolidated with the *Synopsys v. Ricoh* action; Ricoh hereby joins in the suggestion for consolidation. While consolidation has not yet taken place, the defendants have filed a motion to stay this case in its entirety which is scheduled to be heard on December 9, 2003. Ricoh is opposing that motion on many grounds, including, *inter alia*, the need for discovery of the defendants in the present case even if a stay is granted and the issues in the present action would not necessarily be resolved even if Synopsys prevails in the other action, causing this action to be reactivated after a hiatus of more than one year.

Ricoh submits that holding a Case Management Conference in this Court earlier than 13 months after the Complaint was filed and 5 months after the case was transferred is warranted. Delay resulting from the transfer was inevitable but it should be minimized as much as possible.

Actually, this would be the second Case Management Conference in this action. What is needed is to adapt the Order issued by Delaware District Court Judge Sleet to the local rules of this Court, rather than start completely from scratch. The parties should know when activities scheduled by Judge Sleet will be due in this Court. For instance, this case is still operating under a Court Order setting a fact discovery cut-off date in January 2004, a month before the Case Management Conference is now scheduled to be held! Consideration of consolidation, one of the reasons defendants asked to have the case transferred here in the first place, is also better held earlier than later. The discovery which was underway when this case was transferred has languished (as apparent from the currently pending motions relating thereto) and that can be remedied by direction and guidance from this Court.

The parties are currently scheduled to be before the Court in connection with a pending motion on December 9, 2003. Since counsel for all parties in this and the related case will be present, it is

suggested the Case Management Conference be held on that day.

III CONCLUSION

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

For the foregoing reasons, the Court should reset the date for the Case Management Conference earlier than February 10, 2004, and preferably on December 9, 2003.

Dated: November 18, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

Ricoh Company, Ltd.

By: Edward Meilman Jeffrey B. Demain, State Bar No. 126715 Jonathan Weissglass, State Bar No. 185008 Altshuler, Berzon, Nussbaum, Rubin & Demain 177 Post Street, Suite 300 San Francisco, California 94108 Phone: (415) 421-7151 Fax: (415) 362-8064

Gary M. Hoffman Ken Brothers Eric Oliver DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP 2101 L Street NW Washington, D.C. 20037-1526 Telephone: (202) 785-9700 Facsimile: (202) 887-0689

Edward A. Meilman DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP 1177 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10036 Telephone: (212) 896-5471 Facsimile: (212) 997-9880

Attorneys for Ricoh Company, Ltd.

19 20 21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

CASE NO. CV 03-04669-MJJ RICOH'S MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE